Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/518,155	VASSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	AARON S. AUSTIN	1794
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>AARON S. AUSTIN</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Andrew Wilford</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 September 2008	Time: <u>3:00 and 3:45</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: All		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE	EDAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet	INTERATORE OF WHAT WAS	, blooddeb.
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
/John J. Zimmerman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The interview was in response to a call from the Examiner on 8/25/09 directed toward defining the claimed thermally stressed component and clarifying issues under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. More particularly, the present interview provided authorization from the Applicant to amend the claims to 1) correct the claimed formula to reflect that provided for by the specification, 2) clarify the language of claims 13 and 14 to reflect that provided by the specification, 3) define the coating as one for turbine components to better define the invention over prior art, and 4) correct for issues under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.